2/16/70

Dear Harold,

Today I received your package of letters from the 12 to 14. Responses must come in bits and peices for I am quite busy with this and other things. I am on to something grand with Humes and Specter, and although what I've been able to dig up from the testimony is smashing, I want to check the technicalities with a thoractic surgeon. Sit tight.

About your camera, I am not sure what you mean about the limit to the amount of use the shutter will survive. I copy as you would normally take a picture. I put a lens in front of the camera lens, center, focus, and snap the shutter. With single lens reflex it is 100 times easier than with my rangefinder which I must center and focus purely mathematically and with an elaborate and burdensome set-up.

The Baker matter still bothers me. Oswald's encounter with McNeil and Allman proves that he did not kill Tippit for it destroys the WC's already tenuous time reconstruction for that. I have written the Archives for any reports or interviews with Gloria Calvery. Also, in his DPD affidavit of 11/22/63, Shelley said that he ran down to Elm and met her. This I just recently found. The thing with Baker is this: if he is unreliable, then his WC testimony does not preclude that it took him a minute just to get to the main entrance. That part of the reconstruction is based soley on him. Do you see what I mean?

The head wounds are real puzzlers, and of all of them, these are the ones that the autopsy docs would least understand. And the best and the only really valid examinations were made before Finck even laid eyes on it, after the brain was removed. With something like that, you just have to see the brain and the skull and scalp all together to get the true picture--and there is a great limit to what the pictures can show. I'm working on a possible head with that; it concerns the 3cm. exit on the head which I discovered. I'm probing Cyril on it for I have my doubts as to whether Fillinger really saw what I was getting at in my questioning on that. As you say, the Harper piece is another thing.

Your 2/14 to "Lou" is enclosed. I appreciate your generous offer. Looking over the list, some things do interest me. The NO test of Wilma Bond and Mary Moorman could be interesting but not of any immediate importance. I would like to see what Nichols had to say as well as Peter Shuster who I understand analyzed a photo of the assass. Definately, I want to see the test. of Richard R. Carr (2/19). He has interested me for some time.

Your letters to the Panel members seems good. (the carbon is too poor to copy so I will type a new one and send that to Dick). I wonder if they will even answer. Boswell never answered a very simple letter of mine and you know how much these guys love you. By the way, I dropped Moritz a reminder note as you suggested. He answered and referred me to Fisher. Will send copies. I find it interesting. If Fisher doesn't answer by end of month, I'll drop him a note too. As I re-read the last one I sent him, I say "How can he ever answer that?" I must credit you--it's a killer.

Another thing I keep forgetting to mention: What do you think of Robert Oswald's book Lee. I've only read what was printed in Look and there are some interesting things in it (like LHO's conversation with Robert on Saturday after assass.) As for fact and ideas about LHO's

guilt (of which he professes to be convinced) I think it is pure crap. He says that if Lee did not practice a lot before the shooting, then he didn't kill the Pres. But he just assumes that Lee did practice, takes the WC's junk, and proceeds to join the others in stabbing an innocent man. "Et tu, Brute?" (Sorry if the Latin is wrong).

In my last letters, I said I did but actually forgot to encose the carbon on Bishop. It is in this time.

There are some other things which I will include in a letter to Dick with a carbon to you.

I have to cut off now.

Best Wishes,

Howard